DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 649 PS 016 634

AUTHOR Ayres, Jerry B.
TITLE Evaluation of Programs for the Preparation of Teachers of Young Children.
PUB DATE Mar 87
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southern Association on Children under Six (38th, Memphis, TN, March 25-28, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Early Childhood Education; *Followup Studies; Higher Education; Longitudinal Studies; Models; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Center for Teacher Education Evaluation TN; *Tennessee Technological University

ABSTRACT

This paper (1) briefly describes Tennessee Technological University's past involvement in teacher education follow-up evaluation; (2) discusses work related to the evaluation of programs training early childhood teachers; and (3) describes a new center established to study teacher education program evaluation. In 1973, the University developed and implemented a longitudinal model for systematic data gathering and for making evaluations of its programs in teacher education. During the past 13 years, a variety of data have been collected on 150 variables from over 200 graduates receiving bachelor's and master's degrees who were trained to teach in kindergarten and the primary grades. Graduates appeared to be at a level comparable to or above the 50th percentile and to exhibit many of the characteristics of good teachers. Because of the project, the teacher preparation programs have developed new modules of study in the elementary and early childhood education programs; made major changes in the historical and sociological foundations of education courses; and introduced more educational technology into the undergraduate teacher preparation curriculum. The final part of the paper discusses the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation, which was established in 1986 and aims to develop and implement teacher education program evaluation models; research teacher education program evaluation; and establish improved delivery systems for information about teacher education program evaluation. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED285649

EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF YOUNG CHILDREN[1]

Jerry B. Ayers
Center for Teacher Education Evaluation
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, TN 38505

PS 016634

An institution of higher education must be accountable for the quality of the graduates of its teacher education programs. The need to evaluate programs for the preservice preparation of teachers of young children and to followup the graduates has always existed; yet, there has been a dearth of models and procedures for conducting the needed studies.

For years most institutions and agencies have conducted very limited followup studies of their graduates via the U. S. Mail. A major impetus for teacher education institutions to evaluate their teacher education programs and graduates came in 1970 with the adoption of revised standards for accreditation of teacher education programs by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The present version of Standard 6.1 states

> The institution keeps abreast of emerging evaluation techniques and engages in systematic efforts to evaluate the quality of its graduates..... (NCATE, 1982, pp. 26-7).

Standard 6.2 requires an institution to evaluate its programs to provide information to identify areas that need strengthening.

> The institution regularly evaluates its teacher education programs and uses the results of its evaluations in the modification and improvement of those programs (NCATE, 1982, p. 27).

NCATE recently approved a new design for accreditation standards that will become effective in 1988 (NCATE, 1985). This "redesign" will put even more emphasis on accountability and the need for systematic evaluation of teacher education programs. Also, the standards set forth by the National Association for the Education of Young Children must be met.

In the last five years a number of organizations and individuals have cited the need for improving teacher education.

---

[1]Presented in part before the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association on Children Under Six, Memphis, TN, April, 1987. The work presented in this paper was supported in part by a grant from the Centers of Excellence program of the State of Tennessee.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jerry B. Ayers
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It was pointed out in Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education (NIE, 1984) that a major condition for improving higher education is the development and implementation of improved assessment and feedback systems. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (1985) and the National Commission of Excellence in Education (1983) indicated similar concerns. Kilgore (1981), Savage (1981), Smith (1982) and Nelli and Nutter (1985) have all expressed a need for systematic evaluation to improve programs for the preparation of teachers.

Purpose of Paper

Teacher education program evaluation is here to stay. Tennessee Technological University has long recognized that improvement of curriculum and programs is dependent upon an adequate system of evaluation. The purposes of this paper are to (1) describe briefly the history of some of the past work in teacher education followup evaluation that has occurred at Tennessee Technological University, (2) present a discussion of the some of the work related to the evaluation of programs for teachers of early childhood education, and (3) describe a new Center that was established at the University that is devoted to the study of teacher education program evaluation.

Tennessee Technological University Followup Program

In 1973 Tennessee Technological University developed and implemented a longitudinal model for systematic data gathering and for making evaluations (both process and product) of its programs in teacher education based on the work of Sandefur (1970). Since inception the model has become an integral part of the operation of the teacher education programs at the University. The model is a useful vehicle for program planning and improvement and in meeting the accountability standards established by such organizations as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the National Council of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification and the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Basis for the Followup Model

The general model developed at Tennessee Technological University was based on generalizations from the research literature on effective teaching and suggested procedures and instrumentation for conducting a product evaluation of teacher education programs. The major goals of the followup model were:

1. To evaluate the objectives of the teacher education programs of Tennessee Technological University through a systematic study of the graduates of the program.

2. To provide information for the faculty and administrators concerned with teacher education programs at Tennessee Technological University in making decisions pertinent to curriculum evaluation and development.

3. To aid in the process of making long-range plans for improving the total program of the University with particular emphasis on teacher education.

Operation of the Model

The basic model provided input from four sources including (1) graduates of the teacher education programs (career base line data), (2) their supervisors (principals), (3) their students, and (4) independent observers. Data were collected over as many as five years on selected groups of the graduates. Each fall up to 60 graduates of the teacher education program for the past year were selected to participate in the evaluation project. Over the 13 year history of the project over 600 bachelor's and master's level graduates participated in the project (see Ayers in references). About 200 have been teachers in grades K-3. Following is a brief description of the instruments and methods used for collecting data from the four basic sources.

Career base line data were collected on a continuing basis. During the first year the graduates participated in the study: they completed the California F-Scale Forms 45 and 40 (Adorno, et al. as a measure of personality, a self-rating device of the achievement of the objectives of the teacher education program, and a questionnaire designed to collect demographic information. Each graduate's transcript was analyzed and such information as standardized test scores (National Teacher Examinations, and American College Test) and grade point averages in major field, professional education, and psychology courses were collected.

Specially trained research assistants visited in the schools of the graduates on one or more occasions each year. The purposes of these visits were to collect data from the principals and students of the graduates and to observe the graduates in the classroom. The principal of each graduate was interviewed and asked to complete two instruments designed to elicit an evaluation of the graduate's performance in the classroom and perceived level of attainment of the objectives of the teacher education program (Sandefur, 1970). The classroom of each graduate was visited and Ryan's Classroom Observation Record (Ryans, 1960), Flanders' Interaction Analysis technique (Amidon & Flanders, 1971) and the Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form (Tuckman, 1976) were employed by the research assistants to collect direct information about the performance of the graduates in the classroom. The Student Evaluation of Teacher-II (SET-II) described by Haak, Kleiber, and Peck (1972), was used to obtain ratings from pupils of teachers in grades K-3. The instrument was designed to measure rapport, teaching style, and ability to foster self-esteem.

Data analyses, over the years have included a variety of techniques. The information shown in this paper was derived from a variety of reports and analyses of the accumulative data. Means, standard deviations, and the analysis of variance were employed in the data analyses presented in this paper.

Results of the 13 Year Project

The results of the 13 years of studies are contained in over 90 reports and papers. A variety of items are contained in the ERIC Document collection that provide a substantial amount of information about the project. ERIC Document No. 268 080 contains a copy of all of the instrumentation used in the project, while ERIC Document 275 635 contains an up-to-date listing of all of the documents, papers, etc. prepared related to the project.

A major objective of the project was to improve the teacher education programs of Tennessee Technological University. In earlier studies (Ayers, 1980) it was found that there appeared to be few changes in the graduates of the teacher education programs over a period of several years, in spite of changes in the curricula of the institution. Therefore, it was felt that this was a primary area for additional study. Therefore, this section presents a comparison summary of data for bachelor's graduates over the 13 year period. In order to keep this section at a managable level, data were shown for only the first, fifth, ninth and thirteenth year of the project. Comparisons were made by use of analysis of variance across all 13 years: however, there were basically no differences in the first year groups in spite of changes in the curriculum. Following is a summary of the information gathered from the graduates, their students, their principals, and by independent observers. It should be noted that the four years picked for inclusion in the this paper included the first and last and two in the middle at four year intervals.

Personal Variables

A variety of personal variables were collected on each graduate. Table 1 shows a comparison of four variables. The California F-scale was administered to the graduates at the time of the initial visit by research assistants to collect observational data. Over the 13 year period there was a gradual increase (n.s.) in mean score on the F-scale. The groups appeared to become slightly more closed-minded in their beliefs. This probably was a reflection of the changes in values in society. When this project was initiated, the Vietnam War had just ended and the "scandals" of Watergate were just beginning.

Mean American College Test (ACT) scores decreased over the 13 year period of the study. It should be noted that the ACT was taken prior to admission to the University. The mean score dropped 1.4 points from 18.9 in 1973 to 17.5 in 1985. In spite

Table 1.-Comparison of Mean Scores for First Year Early Childhood Graduates on Selected Personal Variables

	1973 (Year I)	1977 (Year V)	1981 (Year IX)	1985 (Year XIII)
California F-Scale				
Mean Score	93.0	94.0	100.2	97.0
St. Dev.	18.0	23.2	16.3	17.2
Sample Size	19	9	9	8
American College Test				
Mean Composite Score	18.9	18.7	18.0	17.5
St. Dev.	4.9	4.3	4.0	5.0
Sample Size	17	8	9	8
National Teacher Examination				
Mean Composite Score	1100	1125	1138	NTE Revised in 1983
St. Dev.	100	100	93	
Sample Size	16	9	8	
Grade Point Averages				
Mean College GPA	2.90	3.00	3.08	3.12
St. Dev.	0.40	0.40	0.42	0.37
Sample Size	20	10	10	9

of this decline, other indicators of success in college and in the classroom were up. For example from 1973 through 1981, there was a gradual increase in mean Composite Score derived from the National Teacher Examinations (NTE) in 1973 the mean score was 1100 compared to 1138 in 1985. This 38 point increase in the mean NTE score could be be attributed to changes in the curriculum of the teacher education program of the University. The NTE was changed in 1982 and it is not possible to make comparisons with the revised form of the instrument.

Mean grade point averages (GPA) for the graduates were shown in Table 1. Over the period mean GPAs increased from 2.90 to 3.12. This is probably in line with the general "grade inflation" that has occurred in higher education.

Principal Ratings

A crude indicator of success in the classroom is the ratings given by principals. Table 2 shows a comparison of the mean ratings given by the principals of the graduates on Evaluation by Supervisor instrument developed by Sandefur (1970). Mean ratings increased during the 13 year period by about 0.4 points and the standard deviations decreased about 0.2 points. On the surface it appeared the first year teachers in 1985 might be better prepared than their counter parts of 1973.

Student Evaluations of Teaching

The students of the graduates in grades K-3 were asked to complete the SET-II. Table 3 shows a comparison of the data across the 13 year period. The SET-II was not introduced into the study until the third year of operation. In general scores across the 11 year period decreased on the three major factors. No explanation can be offered for these results.

Observation Data

Three instruments were used that required the gathering of data through direct observation of the graduates in the classroom. The results were shown in Table 4. It should be noted that observer relabilities across the years were on the order of 0.80. Results of the use of Flanders interaction analysis indicated the graduates were tending to use more direct teaching methods (n.s.) in the later years of the study. Also it appeared that better use was being made of classroom time (Silence/Total Teaching ratio) and the amount of student talk (i.e., asking questions) in the classroom increased.

The Classroom Observation Record (Ryans, 1960) was employed at the end of each observation period. Factor analysis studies that were carried out indicated the instrument appeared to be measuring three factors. Mean scores on the cognitive and affective factors increased four points and five points, respectively. Scores derived from the student factor increased a mean of one point over the 12 year period.

Table 2.-Comparison of Mean Principals' Ratings of Early Childhood Graduates

	Variable	1973 (Year I)			1977 (Year V)			1981 (Year IX)			1985 (Year XIII)		
		N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD
I	Subject	20	4.0	0.7	10	4.1	0.6	10	4.4	0.5	8	4.5	0.5
II	Relations with Students	20	4.1	0.7	10	4.3	0.7	10	4.4	0.6	8	4.4	0.5
III	Appropriateness of Assignments	20	4.3	0.7	10	4.3	0.6	10	4.3	0.6	7	4.3	0.4
IV	Overall Effectiveness	10	4.0	0.6	10	4.0	0.6	10	4.3	0.4	8	4.4	0.4

Table 3.-Comparison of Results of the Use of Student Evaluation of Teacher

Variable	1973 (Year I)			1977 (Year V)			1981 (Year IX)			1985 (Year XIII)		
	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD
Rapport	Instrument not used in first year of study			10	5.5	0.6	8	5.6	0.4	6	5.5	0.4
Stimulating Interaction Style of Study				10	9.4	2.7	8	10.1	0.6	6	8.8	1.2
Fosterance of Self Esteem				10	6.8	0.8	8	6.7	0.5	6	6.3	0.5

Table 4.-Comparison of the Use of Observation Instruments with Early Childhood Graduates

Variable or Factors	1973 (Year I)			1977 (Year V)			1981 (Year IX)			1985 (Year XIII)		
	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD
Flanders Interaction Analysis												
Indirect/Direct Teaching	20	0.89	0.75	10	0.98	0.89	10	0.91	0.70	8	0.67	0.42
Revised Indirect/ Direct Teaching	20	1.58	1.72	10	1.89	1.40	10	1.60	1.70	8	1.62	1.63
Student Talk/Teacher Talk	20	0.71	0.57	10	0.72	0.67	10	0.72	0.32	8	0.72	0.30
Silence/Total Teaching	20	0.42	0.93	10	0.30	0.38	10	0.38	0.40	8	0.30	0.28
Lecture/Total Teaching	20	0.37	0.20	10	0.27	0.22	10	0.36	0.20	8	0.38	0.15
Classroom Observation Record[a]												
Factor I Cognitive	20	40	3.3	10	41	4.0	10	42	1.7	8	44	3.6
Factor II Affective	20	62	6.0	10	63	5.1	10	65	3.4	8	67	5.0
Factor III Students	20	22	3.0	10	22	3.0	10	23	2.2	8	23	3.8
Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form												
Creativity	Instrument not used in the first four years of the study.			10	30	7.6	10	31	5.8	8	32	6.8
Dynamism (Dominance of Energy)				10	30	6.6	10	33	3.8	8	33	4.4
Organized Demeanor (Organization and Control)				10	35	5.0	10	36	4.0	8	40	3.6
Warmth and Acceptance				10	39	4.4	10	37	3.4	8	39	4.5

[a]Based on factor analysis of the 22-item instrument. Factor I consisted of items 10,12,14,15,16,17,18; Factor II consisted of 5,6,7,8,9,11,13,19,20,21,22; and Factor III consisted of 1,2,3,4.

The Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form (Tuckman, 1976) was introduced into the study in 1977. Over the nine year period, the mean scores for organization and control increased four points (n.s.). This corresponds to the findings from the use of the SET. Other factor scores remained about the same across the nine years of the study.

The results of the 13 year study were not startling and will not drastically effect the preparation of teachers. However: some useful information was gathered that was used in the improvement of the teacher education programs of Tennessee Technological University. The data gathered across the 13 year period indicated that some changes did occur in the students and in the curricula of the programs. What can be attributed to curricula changes may be debatable. However, the faculty of the institution did receive feedback and did obtain some useful information for program improvement. The next section of this paper provides information about changes for the future and other ways to improve curricula.

The Future

Education is of paramount importance to improving all aspects of life. Virtually all of the states have made extensive revisions in their education systems or legislation is being considered that will ensure major revisions (SREB, 1985). Tennessee is no exception. The 93rd General Assembly, in a special session, enacted the **Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 (CERA)**. As a result of this legislation, public education is being greatly enhanced. To meet the challenges of the **CERA**, higher education must change and improve programs for the preparation of teachers. One key to improving teacher education is completing evaluations of existing programs and including evaluation designs in the implementation of the new programs.

The problems in Tennessee are not unique. Throughout the United States there is an increasing demand that schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDE) revise their programs based on comprehensive evaluations. Internal pressures encourage institutions to demonstrate program effectiveness, while external mandates for meeting accreditation standards reinforce the need to engage in systematic evaluation activities. Without well developed program assessment followed by systematic implementation of the changes warranted by the examination, it is difficult to imagine how continuous increases in program effectiveness can be attained.

In 1984, there were 1,287 institutions offering programs for the preparation of teachers to enter the schools (Feistritzer, 1984). No two programs are exactly alike. However, there are common patterns in many different programs. For years, many institutions have conducted very limited followup studies of their graduates. These studies have consisted largely of asking the graduates to indicate how well they were doing as teachers

and requesting them to make suggestions for improvements in the teacher preparation programs they had completed. To meet the evaluation needs of the institutions, additional work must be carried out to translate theoretical constructs into practical models and systems that can be used in improving programs for the preparation of teachers (deVoss, 1981: Kilgore, 1981: Savage, 1981).

In 1984 as a part of CERA the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) was given the authority to establish Centers of Excellence on campuses of public institutions of higher education. The purposes of these Centers were to improve the economic, cultural and social opportunities available to the citizens of the State of Tennessee. Tennessee Technological University developed a proposal, that was approved for funding by the THEC for the establishment of a Center for Teacher Education Evaluation. The primary mission of the Center is to explore ways to improve teacher education through program evaluation. The following statement by Hord, Savage and Bethel (1982) expresses the need for the establishment of the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation

> What procedures can be used for assessing the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and for obtaining data on which to base program improvement? One teacher education task force studying evaluation and program development assessed the state of the art of evaluation in teacher education as "one of conflicting research results, lack of clarity and agreement about evaluation designs, and a fragmentation of evaluation focus" (Strathe, 1982). Such evaluation of teacher preparation programs has been primarily focused on follow-up studies of graduates. The studies have examined various information about graduates including graduates' perceptions about and satisfaction with their programs, and ratings of the graduates' performance by supervising teachers, principals and others. Despite the pressure exerted by internal needs for evaluation and external mandates from the state or national level for accreditation, the state of the art has advanced little. Cooper (1980) observes that "very little of what is known about evaluation models and assessment procedures have been applied to teacher education programs. The methodologies ... are not well developed."

Efforts have been made in the past by a number of individuals and groups to develop models for use in teacher education evaluation. For example the theoretical models developed by Borich, Smith, and Stufflebeam (Hord, Savage & Bethel, 1982) have promise for use in solving the problems of teacher education evaluation. The followup evaluation model advanced by Sandefur (1970) still has much to offer. However, there is a need for further work to bring these models to a state where they can be applied at institutions in a comprehensive meaningful manner. Also, these models do not fully address the

problems associated with evaluation of graduate level programs for the preparation of teachers nor programs for the preparation of school service personnel (e.g., principals and counselors).

Operation of the Center

The Center for Teacher Education Evaluation is a five year on-going project that began operation July 1, 1986 and will continue a minimum of five years. The annual budget of the Center derived from state funding was $250,000 in 1986-87. Due to a revenue shortfall in the State, it is anticipated that the Center budget will be reduced about 50% in 1987-88, with the expectation that it will be increased to its original level of funding in 1988-89 and thereafter. In addition, the Center is expected to raise a minimum of one dollar for each two dollars derived from state appropriations to further support the operation of the Center.

The objectives of the Cente is on the development and implementation of new and improved models for the evaluation of teacher education programs. The current Tennessee Technological Univsity Teacher Evaluation Model has been confined largely to followup studies of the graduates of the teacher education programs. It is proposed that the followup model will be expanded to include at least five additional areas of study. It has been demonstrated in a number of studies summarized by Medley, Coker and Soar (1984) and Zimpher and Ashburn (1985) that followup evaluation is the most pertinent area of study in the evaluation and improvement of programs for the preparation of teachers. Therefore, a major focus of the Model will still he on followup evaluation. Other types of models will be examined in future years of the project.

The new proposed system or model will examine variables under six broad categories. Following are the six broad categories and a suggested list of some of the variables that may be examined as a part of the development and field testing a new model.

1. Teacher Candidates-
   - Formative experiences (e.g. SES, sex, age, standardized test scores)
   - Intelligence
   - Motivation
   - Personality

2. Education Unit-
   - Organizational conditions (e.g., physical facilities, financial,political)
   - Regulatory policies (e.g. standards, accreditation)
   - Social Climate

3. Program-
   - Goals
   - Faculty
   - Knowledge base
   - Courses

4.	Outcomes-	Knowledge of teacher candidates Placement Records Standardized measures (e.g., National Teacher Examinations) Length of Career
5.	Followup-	Teaching processes Classroom context School Context Success on the Tennessee Career Ladder or through a program of another state
6.	Pupil Outcomes-	Cognitive Affective Psychomotor

Various specialized studies will be undertaken in each of the broad areas noted above. Appropriate instrumentation and techniques will be derived and investigated. For example, the evaluation of pupils of the graduates is a controversial subject in the research literature. It has been pointed out by a number of researchers including Nelli and Nutter (1985) that

> evaluation and research does not permit pupil outcomes as a practical basis for evaluating programs because we cannot yet tie pupil outcomes to specific program contents.

As an initial approach to the implementation of the Model proposed above, the work of Stufflebeam (1981 & 1982) will serve as a basis for the overall guidance of the implementation of the project. Stufflebeam's basic plan includes the evaluation of the Context, Input, Process, and Product of a teacher education program (CIPP Model). Other models and processes for implementation will be developed and field tested.

Implementation of the model will require the use of a variety of research designs and methods. Sandefur (1982) and Biddle and Anderson (1986) summarized a variety of techniques that could be used in the evaluation of teacher education programs. Selected designs and methods will be fully investigated as a part of the operation of the Center.

Specialized studies of the various components of the model proposed above have been completed or are being undertaken. For example a study of the concurrent and predictive validity of the of the National Teacher Examinations and the relationship of achievement on the American College Test to scores on the Pre-Professional Skills Tests have been completed. An examination is being made of the use of the Classroom Observations Keyed for Effectiveness Research (Coker, 1978, Coker & Coker, 1982a,b; Coker, Lorentz & Medley, 1976) as a primary observation instrument in followup studies.

There are a lack of models and techniques for the evaluation of programs for the preparation of school service personnel. For example, work is beginning on the development of a model that can be used to evaluate programs for the preparation of school librarians. Studies are underway across the country on the role and scope of the principalship. To meet this end, the Center will begin work in the next year on the development and field testing of models for the preparation of school administrative personnel.

GOAL B. To further research in the area of teacher education program evaluation.

An integral part of the activities of the Center includes conducting appropriate research and development work that will support and supplement the goal related to model development. It is difficult in some cases to separate fully research work from the development of models. Following is a description of several of the research projects that are being undertaken to support the major mission of the development and implementation of teacher education program evaluation models.

Basic research on the development of valid and reliable measures to evaluate such elements as undergraduate achievement of preservice teachers, the formative elements of courses, and the administrative structure of SCDE is underway. The staff is beginning extensive development, field testing and refinement of a number of instruments that will be used as a part of the models and research work that will be accomplished by the Center. The work of Banghart (1969) and Cook (1966) is being used in guiding the work.

In order to assess the role of the dean or department chair in preparing teachers, a study has been initiated to determine who are the most effective and why. A study will begin in the spring of 1987 of a group of teachers who are effective in the mainstreaming of special children in the regular classroom. In turn the data collected will be correlated with the type of preparation the individuals had completed in preservice and inservice education programs.

GOAL C. To establish improved delivery systems for information about teacher education program evaluation.

The third goal of the Center may be the most important. To achieve the mandates of the CERA many institutions of higher education in Tennessee may be in need of assistance. The Center can provide the needed help. As a part of the activities of dissemination, a detailed plan is being developed that will be designed to aid institutions of higher education in improving their programs. The major focus during the first year will be on Tennessee; however, the Center will be global. The Center can provide technical assistance to public school systems and other agencies. For example, the work of the Center can be utilized in the evaluation of inservice programs for teachers and other

professionals. In turn this can lead to improved programs for inservice education.

In May of 1987, the Center will sponsor a conference in Nashville, TN on Teacher Education Evaluation: Some Missing Links 1987-88. In 1988 the Center will host the Southeast Regional Conference of Division G of AERA. The theme of the second conference will be on the social issues related to teacher education evaluation. and will be held in March of 1988. Other major conferences focusing on the work of the Center and related rojects will be conducted during 1989, 1990, and 1991. Representatives from higher education, governing bodies, the public schools, and other agencies will be invited to attend and to also share their work. The proceedings of each meeting or conference will be made available for dissemination. Reports, papers and other documents will be disseminated in a systematic manner through the usual means of communication among professional educators, i.e., ERIC, the journal literature and occasional papers.

Summary

Tennessee Technological University has long recognized the importance of systematic evaluation. In 1973, the University developed and implemented a longitudinal model for systematic data gathering and for making evaluations (both process and product) of its programs in teacher education. The model has been a useful vehicle in program planning and improvement and in meeting the accountability standards established by such organizations as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 1985).

The main goals of the system were to evaluate the objectives of the teacher education programs, provide information to the faculty and administrators making decisions on curriculum evaluation and development, and aid in long-range planning for the entire institution. The system has proven to be a useful tool to the University and has been widely recognized as an exemplary project.

During the past 13 years, a variety of data have been collected on 150 variables from over 200 K-3 graduates of the bachelor's and master's level programs of the University. This information has proven useful in program developed and modifying the existing programs. As a whole the graduates of the teacher education programs appeared to be at a level comparable to or above the 50th percentile and were exhibiting many of the characteristics of good teachers. Results derived from the project have resulted in such changes in the teacher preparation programs as new modules of study in the elementary and early childhood education programs, major changes in the courses in the historical and sociological foundations of education, and the introduction of more educational technology into the undergraduate teacher preparation curriculum.

Based on the work of the past, the future of teacher education program evaluation is bright. It was recognized that there was a need for a major Center designed to study ways to improve the evaluation of programs for the preparation of teachers. A center devoted to the study of teacher education program evaluation and allied areas was established at Tennessee Technological University in the summer of 1986 through the Centers of Excellence program administered by the THEC. The five year project is designed to aid in the process of improving teacher education, not only in Tennessee but throughout the United States.

The major activities of the Center are divided among three major goals that include development and implementation of teacher education program evaluation models, research associated with teacher education evaluation and dissemination of materials for use by higher education and other agencies. The major emphases under the first goal are the development and refinement of a model(s) for use by higher education in meeting the mandates of the CERA and the evaluation requirements of such agencies as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. The second goal provides latitude in conducting basic research that can be used in support of the work on the development of models. The third goal provides a means for dissemination of the results of the research and development work. Specialized objectives guide each of the major goals. Projects are being undertaken that will meet the objectives of the Center.

The resources of the Center are available to, not only Tennessee institutions, but colleges and universities, public and private schools, and other agencies throughout the United States. Additional information about the Center, the services that can be provided, and publications can be obtained from Director, Center for Teacher Education Evaluation, Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, TN 38505.

References

Adorno, T. W., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, R. N. Sanford, B. Aron, M. H. Levinson, and W. Morrow. (1964). The Authoritarian Personality. New York: John Wiley.

Amidon, E. J. and N. A. Flanders. (1971). The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom. Minneapolis: Association for Productive Teaching.

Ayers, Jerry B. A series of reports have been prepared over the 13 years of the project that describe the project in detail and the results that have been obtained. Each of the major documents are contained in the ERIC system. Following is a list of the pertain ERIC Doucment Numbers 095 169,123 210, 126 085, 148 778, 152 695, 167 487, 179 535, 191 833, 211 488, 217 020, 232 974, 252 517, 268 080(includes copies of all instruments) 275 635.

Ayers, Jerry B. (1980 April). "A Longitudinal Study of Teachers." Presented before the Annula Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Ayers, Jerry B. (1982). Teacher Evaluation in Early Childhood Education: Application of a Model," in Ni-Janiv, Nechama: Bernard Spodek; and Doreen Steg (eds.). Early Childhood Education: An Interantional Perspective. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 457-467.

Banghart, Frank W. (1969). Educational Systems Analysis. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Biddle, Bruce J. and Donald S. Anderson. (1968). "Theory, Methods, Knowledge, and Research on Teaching," in Wittrock, Merlin C. (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd Ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Coker, Joan G. (1968) A Study of Student Teaching Using Direct Observation. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Georgia State University.

Coker, Homer and Joan G. Cooker (1982a). Classroom Observations Keyed for Effectiveness Research-Observer Training Manual. Atlanta: Georgia State University/Carroll County Teacher Corps Project.

Coker, Homer and Joan G. Coker. (1982b). Classroom Observations Keyed for Effectiveness Research-User's Manual. Atlanta: Georgia State University/Carroll County Teacher Corps Project.

Coker, H., J. L. Lorentz and D. M. Medley. (1976). Implications for Teacher Education Derived from the West Georgia Competency Based Teacher Certification Project. Carrollton, GA: West Georgia College. (Unpublished manuscript).

Cook, Desmond L. (1966). Program Evaluation and Review Technique: Applications in Education. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

deVoss, Gary G. 1981). "Groping... And Coping... With Contraditory Evaluation Requirements," in Hord, Shirley M. and Ronald D. Adams (Eds.). Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Feistritzer, C. Emily. (1984). The Making of a Teacher. Washington: Feistritzer Publications.

Haak, R. A., D. A. Kleiber and R. F. Peck. (1972). Student Evaluation of Teacher Instrument, II. Austin: The University of Texas.

Hord, Shirley M., Tom V. Savage and L. J. Bethel. (1982). Toward Usable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Kilgore, Al. (1981). "Small College Needs in Follow-up Evaluation Studies," in Hord, Shirley M. and Ronald D. Adams (Eds.). Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Medley, Donald M., Homer Coker, and Robert S. Soar. (1984). Measurement-Based Evaluation of Teacher Performance. New York: Longman.

Medley, Donald M., Homer Coker, Joan G. Coker, Jeffrey L. Lorentz, Robert S. Soar, and Robert L. Spaulding. (1981). "Assessing Teacher Performance from Observed Competency Indicators Defined by Classroom Teachers," Journal of Educational Research. 74, 197-216.

National Commission of Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1982). Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington: NCATE.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1985). NCATE Redesign. Washington: NCATE.

National Institute of Education. (1984). Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Nelli, Elizabeth and Norma Nutter. (1985). A Model for Evaluating Teacher Education Programs. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Sandefur, J. T. (1970). An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Sandefur, J. T. (1982). "Teacher Education's Evaluation of Graduates: Where Are We Going and How Do We Know When We Get There?" in Hord, Shirley M., Tom V. Savage and Lowell J. Bethel (Eds.). Toward Usable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluation. Austin, TX: The Universityof Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Savage, Tom V. (1981). "Teacher Education Program Evaluation: A Search for Alternatives," in Hord, Shirely and Ronald D. Adams (Eds.). Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Smith, Nick L. (1982). "Introductory Guidelines for Designing Evaluations of Teacher Education Programs," in Hord, Shirley M., Tom V. Savage and Lowell J. Bethel. Toward Usable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1985). Career Ladder Plans: Trends and Emerging Issues-1985. Atlanta: SREB.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. (1981). Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. (1982). "Exploration in the Evaluation of Teacher Education," in Hord, Shirley M., Tom V. Savage and Lowell J. Bethel. Toward Usable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Tuckman, Bruce W. (1976). "The Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form (TTFF)," Journal of Educational Measurement. 13, 233-237.

Zimpher, Nancy L. and Elizabeth A. Ashburn. (1985). "Studying the Professional Development of Teachers: How Conceptions of the World Inform the Research Agenda," Journal of Teacher Education. 36(6), 16-26.